

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/753,483	01/09/2004	Sumio Okuno	648.41258CX1	6885	
20457 75	590 04/19/2005		EXAM	INER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET			JULES, FF	JULES, FRANTZ F	
SUITE 1800	SE VENTEENTH STREE	51	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ARLINGTON,	VA 22209-3873		3617	3617	
			DATE MAILED: 04/19/200	DATE MAILED: 04/19/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application	NO.	Applicant(s)	
	10/753,483		OKUNO ET AL.	•
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Frantz F. Ju		3617	
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	cation appears on the c	over sheet with the co	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOTHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30). If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum states a failure to reply within the set or extended period for	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, unication.) days, a reply within the statutor uttory period will apply and will ex will. by statute, cause the applicat	however, may a reply be time y minimum of thirty (30) days quire SIX (6) MONTHS from the	ely filed will be considered timely. he mailing C & 1330	ation.
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on			
	b)⊠ This action is non	-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition f	or allowance except for	formal matters, pros	secution as to the merit	s is
closed in accordance with the practic	e under <i>Ex parte Quay</i>	le, 1935 C.D. 11, 453	3 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-4.6-10 and 12 is/are pend 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) ☑ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-9 is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 10 and 12 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restrict	e withdrawn from consi		·	
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including to 11) The oath or declaration is objected to	a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ ion to the drawing(s) be h he correction is required i	eld in abeyance. See to the drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). cted to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do some * Copies of the priority do some * See the attached detailed Office action	ocuments have been no couments have been no fithe priority documents all Bureau (PCT Rule 1	eceived. eceived in Application s have been received 7.2(a)).	n No I in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT	4) O-948)	Interview Summary (F	e	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Other:	ent Application (PTO-152)	
S. Patent and Trademark Office TOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)	Office Action Summary	Part	of Paper No./Mail Date 0415	2005

Application/Control Number: 10/753,483 Page 2

Art Unit: 3617

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashima et al (US 6,196,135) in view of Pavlick et al (US 4,715,292) and Torke (US 3,983,962).

Kashima et al teach all the limitations of claims 10 and 12 except for a railway car in which the underframe of both end of the car constituting a portion of a passenger room are made of softer material formed by annealing. The general concept of providing shock absorbing material to both end of a railcar constitutes an obvious duplication of parts and is well known in the art as illustrated by Pavlick et al which disclose the teaching of providing shock absorbing material to both end of a passenger rail car.

Also, the general concept of using the process of annealing a material used in a vehicle for the purpose of absorbing energy is well known in the art as illustrated by Torke which discloses the use of annealing process in the softening a frame member used for energy absorbing purpose, see fig. 1, col. 1, lines 5-8, lines 48-51, lines 55-57, lines 64-68. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kashima et al to include the use of providing both end of the car constituting a portion of a passenger room with a material made of softer or impact

Art Unit: 3617

absorbing material in his advantageous railway car as taught by Pavlick et al in order to provide safety for the passengers in case of an accident. In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kashima et al to include the use of material softened by annealing process in both longitudinal ends of the underframe of the railway car as taught by Torke in order to increase the buckling resistance of the frame member, prevent perpendicular extension of corrugation to the bending edge of the frame members thereby increasing safety during a collision.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-4, 6-9 stand allowable.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 02/28/2005 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the allowance of claims 1-4, 6-9 and of the new ground of rejection. Applicant's argument that Pavlick et al fails to disclose material that shrink at the underframe of a portion of a passenger room is weak as the Pavlick et al reference clearly provides a teaching of material that shrink in the underframe of "a portion of a passenger room" where the crew members would be located.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz F. Jules whose telephone number is (703) 308-8780. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

Art Unit: 3617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph S. Morano can be reached on (703) 308-0230. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frantz F. Jules Primary Examiner Art Unit 3617

FFJ

April 15, 2005

FRANTZ F. JULES
PRIMARY EXAMINED